DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 276 PS 014 686

AUTHOR Connolly, Frances T.; Figgures, Cleo
TITLE School Age Program: Unique Approaches to Using Community Resources; and Technical Summary: Evaluation of the Child Care Program, 1982-1983. Report No. 8433.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jun 84
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the School-Age Child Care: It Works! Conference (Vienna, VA, April 12-13, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Child Development; *Class Activities; *Day Care; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Experience; *Outcomes of Education; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Scheduling; *School Age Day Care; Social Services; Teachers; Volunteers
IDENTIFIERS Philadelphia School District PA

ABSTRACT

A brief description of programs providing school-age care in the Philadelphia School District is provided (the text of a 1984 School Age Child Care Conference presentation). Appended to the speech text is a technical summary of the 1982-83 program evaluation of one such program: the Child Care Program. Descriptive material provided in the technical summary emphasizes child care centers and focuses on background, history, funding, program, schedule, resources, and research related to school-age care. Evaluation material consists of 12 tables and accompanying summary statements concerning the educational, parent involvement, social services, and staff development components of the program. Generally, programs emphasized language/vocabulary skills. Children were found to be developing adequately. Program graduates in kindergarten through fifth grade exceeded national norm expectations by a large margin in both reading and mathematics. Additionally, 4,764 volunteer hours were recorded; 22,000 social service contacts were made; and at least three-fourths of responding teachers, assistant teachers, and aides reported having 7 years or more teaching experience at the preschool through fourth-grade levels. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED252276

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

School Age Program - Unique Approaches to Using Community Resources

School District of Philadelphia

Presentation April 12, 1984
School-Age Child Care It Works!
Fairfax County
Office for Children

I am representing the School District of Philadelphia and I would like to describe to you the programs currently existing which provide school-age care in the Philadelphia School District. School-age care is not merely an extended day care service but it is instead a full component service; it is under the Early Childhood Division and provides age-appropriate activities.

Background

The School District of Philadelphia has a pupil enrollment of 202,469 children. The Early Childhood Programs provided are:

17 Child Care Centers

49 Get Set Centers

20 Parent Co-op Nurseries

28 Pre-K Head Start Programs

The two programs servicing School-age children are Child Care (begun in 1942, providing School-age care in fifteen of the seventeen centers) and Get Set which has just begun providing care for School-agers in 1984.

History of Philadelphia Child Care Centers

While Day Nurseries have functioned in Philadelphia since the Civil War, the Child Care Centers have been in existence since World War II. In Philadelphia, the program began in 1942, under the Philadelphia Day Care Committee, a branch of the State Council of Defense, as a means of providing care for the children of mothers who were working in defense industries or who were replacing men who had gone into the Armed Services. Because of the need for woman-power in the war-time industries, the federal government, under the Latham Act, appropriated monies to establish and operate Child Care Centers throughout the country.

PS 014686

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Frances T. Connolly
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY

In order to receive the federal funds, it was necessary to have a corporate body to receive the funds and to administer the program, so the Philadelphia Board of Education agreed to accept this responsibility. The Board took over the program on January 1, 1944, and moved centers into existing school buildings wherever possible.

Presently, centers are funded under Operating Budget, Title XX, Block Grant, Parent Fees and C.C.F.P. The guidelines followed are those from the Department of Public Welfare, Bureau of Child Development Programs. The child staff ratio for school-agers is 11:1. Breakfast and lunch funds are provided through the School Age Lunch Program and snack is provided through C.C.F.P. funding.

Each center has a Head Teacher, and is staffed with Teachers, Assistant Teachers, Aides, Cooks and Maintenance Personnel who are employees of the Board of Education. Case work services are provided in each center; health supervision, psychiatric and psychological consultation, speech, hearing, and special education assessments are available.

Application for care can be made in person or telephone, directly to the center nearest the home or the work of the parent. Admission is based on an assessment of the family's need and is contingent upon the existence of openings in the appropriate age groups.

For school age children (6-12) the schedule is planned to provide experiences balancing the school day. In addition to a hot lunch, breakfast and afternoon snacks, time is available for creative experiences with materials, drama, music and dancing. Cooking, playing games, learning to love books, scientific experimentation and trips to investigate the expanding community take place after school. School-agers satisfy their intellectual curiosity with units of research and creative expression reaching into the larger community of the world. School-age children come to the center before school, at lunch time and again after school until the end of the Parents' working day. During vacations and on school holidays, all-day programs are provided.

Typical Day

7:00-8:00	Arrivals multi-group activities
8:00-8:45	Breakfast
8:45-11:30	Public School classes
11;30-12:00	Lunch I 1st and 2nd graders
12:00-12:30	Lunch II 3rd and 4th graders
12:30-2:45	Public School classes

BEST COPY

2:45-3:00	Children return to Child Care Program
3:00-3:15	Afternoon Snack
3:15-4:00	Activity Period Arts and Crafts Dramatic Play Scientific Experiments Cooking, etc.
4:00-4:30	Outdoor Play
4:30-4:45	Gymnastics or Library Time
4:45-5:15	Music or Creative Movement
5:15-5:30	Wrap-up session and clean-up time
5:30-6:00	Multi-age level program

D.P.W. Regulation #146-158 - Homework supervision shall be provided, if desired by the parent or the child.

What are some Program Suggestions?

Children can work independently or in small groups.

Arts and Crafts
Dramatic Play
Scientific Experiments
Cooking
Trips
Newspaper Writing
Computer Programing
Listening Corner
Story Reading
Creative Writing
Nutrition Education
Sex Education
Life Skills

Summer Program

Camp-like atmosphere is provided during the summer. Rooms in the center become activity areas rather than self-contained rooms. Special Days and special week are celebrated and observed on the calendar of events.

Philadelphia School District Resources

Informational Services	T V Department
Press Release	Legal Services
Consummer Education	Affective Education
Museum Education	Affirmative Action
Computer Science	Behavior Analysis Resource Center
Staff Development	Project Success
Department of Curriculum and Development	Replicating Success

These are some of the services and departments within the Philadelphia School District which can be used as resources for School-age Programs.

Research

Each child in Child Care is tested twice each year using the Developmental Behavior Checklist. In 1982-83, which is the most recent data available, graduates of the Child Care Program who were in Kindergarten, through fifth grade exceeded national norm expectations by a large margin in both Reading and Mathematics. They had more than the expected 50% scoring at/above the 50th percentile in Total Reading and Total Mathematics.

The Technical Summary: Evaluation of the Child Care Program is attached for reference.

Frances T. Connolly

BEST COPY

TECHNICAL SUMMARY:

EVALUATION OF

THE CHILD CARE PROGRAM

1982-1983

Report No. 8433

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Philadelphia School District, Pa.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JUNE 1984

PS 014686

OFFICE OF PLANNING, RESEARCH & EVALUATION
PRIORITY OPERATIONS EVALUATION SERVICES
EARLY CHILDHOOD RESEARCH & EVALUATION UNIT

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

Superintendent of Schools
Dr. Constance E. Clayton

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Herman Mattleman, Esq., President
Mrs. Ernestine J. Rouse, Vice President
Mr. Rodney D. Johnson
Mr. Samuel P. Katz
Mrs. Helen Oakes
Mr. Joseph H. Previty
Mr. Samuel H. Rubin
Mr. Arthur W. Thomas
Dr. Christine Torres-Matrullo

Prepared by:
Cleo Figgures
Research Assistant

Report No. 8433
June 1984

Dr. James H. Lytle
Executive Director
Office of Planning, Research
and Evaluation

Dr. Irvin J. Farber
Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Dr. Thomas McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Research
and Evaluation Unit

Mrs. Leontine D. Scott
Executive Director
Early Childhood Education

Miss Rosemary Mazzatenta
Acting Director
Child Care Programs

ABSTRACT

Observations of Child Care classrooms indicated emphasis on the development of language/vocabulary skills.

Overall results from the Developmental Behavior Checklist indicate that children in Child Care in general are developing skills at the same rate as students of other Prekindergarten programs. The total Child Care group, however, were rated somewhat higher than their peers on items of the cognitive subsection.

In 1982-1983, graduates of the Child Care Program who were in Kindergarten, through fifth grade exceeded national norm expectations by a large margin in both Reading and Mathematics (i.e., had more than the expected 50% scoring at/above the 50th percentile in Total Reading and Total Mathematics.)

The total number of volunteer hours reported in eight types of activities for the year in the Child Care Program was 4,764. A little over one-third of these volunteer hours (N=1,772) were spent attending meetings.

Program social service staff made more than 22,000 contacts during the school year. Fifty-one percent of all social service contacts were made with parents, either by phone (26.6%) or through conferences at the child care site (24.4%).

At least 3/4 of the teachers, assistant teachers and aides responding to a staff development questionnaire reported having seven years or more teaching experience in preschool through Grade Four. The majority of teachers, assistant teachers and aides also indicated being satisfied with most of the services provided by supervisory/resource/personnel, and felt that staff development received had helped them do a better job in the classroom.

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

EVALUATION OF THE CHILD CARE PROGRAM, 1982-83

I. EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT

A. Classroom Observation Data

1. Developmental Emphasis (See Table 1)

Table 1

DEVELOPMENTAL EMPHASIS OBSERVED IN THE CHILD CARE PROGRAM (PREKINDERGARTEN OBSERVATION FORM) 1982-83

Developmental Category	Percentage of Time*	Comparison Data**		
		High	Median	Low
Gross Motor	100	100	50	0
Fine Motor Manipulation	86	100	66.5	0
Fine Motor Draw/Write	71	100	41.5	0
Social Interaction/Rapport	86	100	67	50
Social Responsibility/Self-Help	57	83	53.5	22
Ideation - Math/Logic	57	100	62	11
Language	100	100	100	50

*Percentage of time is based on 7 observations of Child Care classrooms. Each category could theoretically show 100% of the total time for all children. Observations were recorded on the Prekindergarten Observation Form (PKOF).

**Comparison data are provided to show the range of values found for all the prekindergarten programs observed.

Summary Statement/Table 1: The activities observed seemed to emphasize a high degree of developing language related skills. Involvement in gross motor activities was also prevalent during all of the observations.

Table 2

Child Care

Frekindergarten Observation* Form Summary

1982-1983

Category	Child Care N	Child Care %	Comparison Data Total PreK N=30		
			High	Median	Low
Grouping Patterns					
Teacher Worked With the Whole Class	5	71	100	85.5	33
Teacher Worked With Small Groups	4	57	67	45	0
Assistant Teacher/Aide Worked With Small Groups	4	57	67	33	0
Parent Scholar Worked with Small Groups	-	-	-	-	-
Volunteer(s) Worked With Small Groups	2	14	100	33	0
Teaching Patterns					
Children Were Told Sepecific Objectives of Each Activity	4	57	100	75	50
Direct Instruction	5	71	100	69	44
Indirect Instruction	1	14	50	23.5	0
Adults Played/Worked Along With Children	6	86	100	87.5	33
Use of Closed Questions	4	57	100	78.5	57
Use of Open Questions	3	43	100	75	33
Clues Given on How to Respond to Questions	3	43	100	58.5	43
Factual Information Given	3	43	100	71.5	0
Use of Positive Reinforcement Techniques	4	57	100	62	33
Children Were Read To	2	29	50	11	0
Children Talked Freely to One Another	5	71	100	69	0
Children Were Actively Engaged in Activities	6	86	100	100	50

*Information Based on Seven (7) Observations

-Number of Adults Present During Observations = 2.7

-Number of Children (Average) = 17.9

-Adult to Child Ratio - 1:6.6

Summary Statement/Table 2: During the majority (71%) of the observations, teachers worked with the whole class in direct instruction (71.7%). To a large degree, the children freely talked to each other (71% of the time) and appeared actively involved in their activities (86% of the time). In comparison with the other PreK Programs, the overall grouping and teaching patterns of the Child Care Program fell in the median range.

The Prekindergarten Observation Form (PKOF) is a checklist developed and used by the Early Childhood Research and Evaluation Unit, to record basic activities, techniques and materials which exist in a prekindergarten classroom.

Table 3

CHILD CARE PROGRAM
Average Number of Items Accomplished on the
Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC), Spring 1983

Name of Subsection	Age Group 1*			Age Group 2*			Age Group 3*		
	Child Care N=188	Total PreK N = 1140	1/3SD	Child Care N=194	Total PreK N = 1643	1/3SD	Child Care N=149	Total PreK N = 1738	1/3SD
Gross Motor (19 items)	14.1	14.2	1.3	16.7	16.8	.9	17.6	17.7	.7
Fine Motor Manipulation (12 items)	8.9	8.6	.8	10.6	10.5	.6	11.2	11.2	.5
Fine Motor Writing (25 items)	12.3	12.0	1.7	17.5	17.8	.6	20.8	20.6	1.4
Social Skills (19 items)	15.2	15.7	1.2	16.9	17.3	.9	17.4	17.8	.8
Self Help (18 items)	14.6	14.8	.8	16.3	16.3	.6	17.0	17.0	.5
Cognitive (43 items)	27.6	26.0	3.0	35.1	34.2	2.5	38.5	37.8	2.0
Language (18 items)	14.5	14.7	1.1	16.6	16.5	.8	17.1	17.1	.7

*Age Group	Birthdate	Age as of December, 1982
1	May, 1979 - June 1980	30 to 43 months
2	September, 1978 - April, 1979	44 to 51 months
3	July, 1977 - August, 1978	52 to 65 months

B. Developmental Status: Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC)

1. Overall Results of the Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC), 1983-84 (See Table 3)

Summary Statement/Table 3: Each DBC mean reported in Table 3 for Child Care (CC) was compared to the corresponding Total PreK (TPK) mean. If any of the Child Care means were within the range of 1/3 of a standard deviation (from the Total PreK mean) they were not considered substantially different.

The data in Table 3 show that the means were essentially similar for all groups on all subsections of the DBC. This indicates that overall, the Child Care children are developing skills at the same rate as children of other prekindergarten programs.

The Developmental Behavior Checklist (DBC) which was used to obtain these data is an instrument developed by the Early Childhood Research and Evaluation Unit to assess developmental status in seven areas (as listed on the Table). It is used by center staff on an on-going basis.

2. Number and Percentage of Children Scoring in the Listed DBC Categories for Matched Fall and Spring Records During 1982-83 (See Table 4)

Table 4

Number and Percentage of Children in the Child Care Program Scoring in the Listed DBC Categories for Matched Fall and Spring Records During 1982-83

Performance Category	Total Program Fall and Spring Matched Pairs		All Seven DBC Subsection Scores Were At or Above the 25th Percentile		One or Two Subsection Scores Were Below the 25th Percentile		Three or More Subesection Scored Were Below the 25th Percentile (Suspicious)		One Each of a Motor, Social, and Cognitive DBC Subsection Was Below the 25th Percentile (Delayed)		One or more DBC Subsections Were Not Completed	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
N	381	381	122	142	130	139	32	41	60	51	37	8
%	100.0	100.0	32.0	37.3	34.1	36.5	8.4	10.8	15.7	13.4	9.7	2.1

Summary Statement/Table 4: As shown in Table 4, in Fall of 1982, 8.4% of the children were assessed as developmentally "suspicious", and 15.7% were characterized as "delayed". In the Spring, 41/381 (10.8%) were characterized as "suspicious", i.e., had scored below the 15th percentile in three or more of the seven DBC subsections; and only 51/381 (13.4%) remained in the "delayed" category, i.e., scored below the 25th percentile in one each of the major DBC sections.

C. Post Program Achievement - Percentage of Child Care Geaduates Scoring Below the 16th Percentile (<16) and At or Above the 50th Percentile (>50) on Citywide Tests, March 1983 as Compared With Total City Performance (TC), Grades K-5 (See Tables 5 and 6)

Summary Statement/Tables 5 and 6:

In Kindergarten through Fifth Grade, Child Care graduates in 1982-1983 exceeded national norm expectations uaually by a large margin, in both Reading and Mathematics (see the following table). More specifically, program graduates had 53% to 85%, i.e., 3% to 35% more than the expected 50% (National norm), scoring at/above the 50th percentile in Total Reading across Grades K-5; and 55% to 75%, i.e., 5% to 25% more than expected, in Total Mathematics across these grades.

In comparison with Total City (TC) performance, Child Care graduates had a significantly higher percentage scoring at/above the expected national average (50th percentile) in Grades 3 to 5, both areas, but did not significantly differ from the Total City K-2 in either area.

Table 5

CHILD CARE: POST PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENT

Percentage of Child Care Graduates (CC) Scoring Below the 16th Percentile (<16) and At or Above the 50th Percentile (>50) on Citywide Tests, March 1983, as Compared with Total City Performance (TC), Grades K-5.

TEST AREA/GROUP	KINDERGARTEN			GRADE ONE			GRADE TWO		
	Total N	<16th %ile	>50th %ile	Total N	<16th %ile	>50th %ile	Total N	<16th %ile	>50th %ile
TOTAL READING*									
CC	169	2	85***	156	2	71***	115	3	68***
TC	13,831	3	83	13,112	6	65	12,069	6	64
TOTAL MATHEMATICS									
CC	169	6	75***	159	4	72***	113	3	65***
TC	13,858	9	70	13,270	7	66	12,101	7	62

*This refers to the Letters and Sounds subtest of the SESAT at K; to Total Reading on the CAT at all other grades.

**The percentage at/above the 50th percentile is significantly higher than that attained by the Total City.

***The percentage at/above the 50th percentile is not significantly different from that attained by the Total City.

Table 6

CHILD CARE: POST PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENT

Percentage of Child Care Graduates (CC) Scoring Below the 16th Percentile (<16) and At or Above the 50th Percentile (>50) on Citywide Tests, March 1983, as Compared with Total City Performance (TC), Grades K-5,

TEST AREA/GROUP	GRADE THREE			GRADE FOUR			GRADE FIVE		
	Total N	<16th %ile	>50th %ile	Total N	<16th %ile	>50th %ile	Total N	<16th %ile	>50th %ile
TOTAL READING									
CC	121	9	56**	127	6	61**	73	12	53**
TC	12,139	12	47	11,860	13	47	12,985	18	37
TOTAL MATHEMATICS									
CC	121	9	69**	127	8	55**	73	10	66**
TC	12,135	10	58	11,838	18	41	12,972	16	44

**The percentage at/above the 50th percentile is significantly higher than that attained by the Total City.

***The percentage at/above the 50th percentile is not significantly different from that attained by the Total City.

IV. PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Table 7

Child Care Program Report of Parent Volunteer Data
1982-83*

Type of Volunteer Hours	Number of Hours
Classroom Participation	764
Participation on Class Trips	524
Attendance at Meetings	1,772
Work Done at Home	463
Fund Raising Events	189
Social Activities	368
Attendance at Workshops	342
Other	342
Total	4,764

*Data was collected on the Parent Volunteer Data Form, (PVDF), an optical scanning document developed by the Early Childhood Research and Evaluation Unit

Summary Statement/Table 7: The total number of volunteer hours reported in eight activities (listed above) was 4,764. Approximately a third (N=1,772) of those hours were spent attending meetings. An equal number of hours (N=342) were spent attending workshops and participating in social activities.

V. SOCIAL SERVICES

A. Number and Percent of Total Contacts/Purpose of Contact

Table 8

Purpose of Contacts	Total Contacts N	%
Classroom Attendance	2,280	10.2
Behavior of Child	2,246	10.1
Health Services for Child (Medical/Dental, Nutr.)	1,997	9.0
Mental Health Services for Child	438	2.0
Progress Report of Child	2,227	10.0
Sharing Program Information with Family	3,441	15.4
Sharing Information About Community Agencies	1,358	6.1
Parent's Employment/Training/ Education/Illness	2,563	11.5
Intake-Termination Process & Recruitment	4,209	18.8
Other	1,543	6.9
Total Number	22,302	100.0

Summary Statement: 18.8% of all social service contacts were made with regard to the intake-termination and recruitment process. Contacts to share program information with the family (15.4%) were next in frequency, followed by contacts regarding parents' employment, etc. (11.5%).

B. Frequency of Contacts

Table 9

Frequency of Various Types of Social Service Contacts

Type of Contact	Frequency of Contacts	
	N	%
Contacts with Parents:		
Phone Contacts	5,923	26.6
Home Visits	0	0.0
Conferences	5,441	24.4
Total	11,364	51.0
Contacts with Community Agencies:		
Sharing/Exchanging Information	1,163	5.2
Referrals/Agencies	685	3.1
Acting on Child's/Adult Behalf	1,566	7.0
Conference with Program Personnel	4,367	19.6
Total	7,781	34.9
Total Number of Contacts[1]	22,302	100.0

[1]Includes contacts in "other" category

Summary Statement: 51% of all social service contacts were made with parents, in the form of phone contacts (26.6%) and conferences at the school site (24.4%). 34.9% of all social service contacts were made in relationship to community agencies, and the remaining contacts, 14.1% fell into the "other" category.

VI. STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

A. Amount of Experience Among Teachers (T), Assistant Teachers (AT) and Aides (A) (See Table 10)

Table 10

Amount of Two Types of Experience

Amount Staff

Category	Less Than One Year			1-3 Years			4-6 Years			7-10 Years			10+ Years		
	T	AT	A	T	AT	A	T	AT	A	T	AT	A	T	AT	A
Preschool - Grade 4 Experience	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	17	20	22	28	12	74	56	64
Experience in the Child Care Program	0	17	4	0	6	20	7	11	24	26	17	12	68	50	40

*Percentages given in Table 10 are based on returns from 27 teachers, 18 assistant teachers, and 25 aides.

Summary Statement/Table 10: The majority of teachers and assistant teachers (over 65%) had seven years or more experience in Prekindergarten (Preschool through Grade 4), as well as in the Child Care Program. Over half the aides also reported being with the program, or having that same amount (at least seven years) of experience in Prekindergarten.

Table 11

Percentage of Teachers, Assistant Teachers and Aides Expressing Satisfaction with Services Provided by Resource/Support/Supervisory Personnal

	Teachers	Assistant Teachers	Aides
	N=27	N=18	N=25
Conducts Workshops	89	89	92
Conducts Group Meetings	59	50	68
Informs You of Program Activities and Changes	48	61	60
Informs You of School Board Administrative Decisions and Procedures	59	56	72
Provides Classroom Demonstrations, or Other On-Site Training	63	56	68
Locates Available Resource Materials	59	72	80
Gives Support to Individual Concerns/ Interpersonal Relationships	41	61	72
Gives Support in Solving Classroom Management Problems	44	67	72
Gives Suggestions About the Effective Use of Curriculum	59	56	80
Offers Support Working With Paraprofessionals and Volunteers	56	61	84
Offers Support in Parent Involvement	67	72	76
Assists in Completion and Submission of Required Data and Other Information	67	67	76
Gives Support in Helping to Individualize Instruction and/or Promote Small Group Instruction	56	78	76
Fosters Team Learning and Instruction	37	44	76

B. Percentage of Teachers, Assistant Teachers and Aides Expressing Satisfaction With Services Provided by Resource/Support/Supervisory Personnel (See Table 11)

Summary Statement/Table 11: The service which appeared to have generated the greatest satisfaction was the workshops conducted during the year. At least 89% of all three instructional groups expressed satisfaction with that service. As a group, the aides appear to be more satisfied overall with services received than teachers or assistant teachers. At least two-thirds of the three groups also reported satisfaction with the support given in parent involvement, and the assistance given in the submission of required data and other information.

Table 12

Percentage of Teachers, Assistant Teachers and Aides Indicating Staff Development in Areas Listed Had Helped Them do a Better Job in the Classroom*

Area of Staff Development	Teachers N=27	Assistant Teachers N=18	Aides N=25
Social Behaviors, Human Relations and/or Interpersonal Skills	59	67	76
Parent Involvement	70	72	80
Child Growth and Development Issues	71	83	80
Curriculum Development	71	94	67
Classroom Management	59	66	80
Helping Children Take Tests	74	94	92
Making Effective Use of Your Physical Space	81	89	72
Improving the Basic Skills or Basic Skills Readiness	78	77	76
Utilization of Personnel	52	78	72
Individualizing Instruction/Small Group	74	72	83
Using Teacher/Resource Center Facilities	22	22	40
Sharing Group Expertise/Team Teaching	52	50	72
Dealing with Suspected Child Abuse/ Neglect	33	50	76
Bilingual Education	48	55	80

*Information in Table 12 is given in percentages. The percentages are based on the N's given in the tables. The item on the staff development questionnaire which survey staff response regarding areas which had helped them do a better job in the classroom was divided into three categories: "little", "moderate", and "great". Table 12 shows combined percentage totals of the "moderate" and "great" categories.

C. Percentage of Teachers, Assistant Teachers and Aides Indicating Staff Development in Areas Listed Had Helped Them do a Better Job in the Classroom (See Table 12)

Summary Statement/Table 12: At least 74% of the teachers, assistant teachers and aides responding to the questionnaire indicated that staff development related to helping children take tests had helped them do a better job in the classroom. In general, however, it appears that staff development given to each of the groups, was helpful to some extent. Among the three instructional groups, a larger percentage of aides overall reported that staff development given was helpful.